

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 20, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 8–20, 22, 24–27, 32–35, and 40–44 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action Summary does not list pending claims 33–35.

In the Office Action, claims 8–20, 22, 24–27, 32–35, and 40–44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,067 to Nakajima et al. (hereinafter “Nakajima”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,751 to Lewis et al. (hereinafter “Lewis”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,196,993 to Herron et al. (hereinafter “Herron”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 40 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 40 is allowable in that it recites a “liquid crystal display module having a metal frame ... an enclosure ... a hinge arm,” and “a front case ... wherein the metal frame, the hinge arm, the enclosure, and the front case are all electrically connected, and wherein the liquid crystal display module is electromagnetically shielded by the front case and grounded through the hinge.” Nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner states that Nakajima teaches “the frame, the hinge arm, the enclosure, and the front case are all electrically connected.” Further, the Examiner states that “Nakajima fails to teach the frame of the liquid crystal display module and the front case being made of metal. (Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully submits that these two statements are incompatible. With respect to the latter statement, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Nakajima fails to teach the front case being made of metal. Given this, Applicant respectfully asserts that because Nakajima does not teach a front case being made of metal, it follows that Nakajima does not teach a front case being electrically connected. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Nakajima does not teach a front case being electrically connected to the frame, the hinge arm, and the enclosure, as recited in independent claim 40.

Further, the Examiner cites Herron as teaching a metal front case. Applicant respectfully points out that nowhere in Herron is there any teaching of the front case being *electrically connected* to the frame, the hinge arm, and the enclosure, as recited in independent claim 40. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 40, and its dependent claims 8–11, are allowable over any combination of Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 41 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 41 is allowable in that it recites “the metal frame, the hinge arm, the enclosure, and the front case are all electrically connected,” and “the liquid crystal display module is electromagnetically shielded by the front case and grounded through the hinge.” Nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same

or similar reason as that regarding independent claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 41, and its dependent claims 12–16, are allowable over any combination of Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 42 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 42 is allowable in that it recites “the metal frame, the hinge arm, the enclosure, and the front case are all electrically connected,” and “the liquid crystal display module is electromagnetically shielded by the front case and grounded through the hinge.” Nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reason as that regarding independent claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 42, and its dependent claims 17–20, are allowable over any combination of Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 43 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 43 is allowable in that it recites “the metal frame, the bezel, the hinge arm, and the enclosure are all electrically connected,” and “the display module is electromagnetically shielded by the bezel and grounded through the hinge arm.” Nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reason as that regarding independent claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 43, and its dependent claims 22 and 24–27, are allowable over any combination of Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 44 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 44 is allowable in that it recites “the metal frame, the bezel, the hinge arm and enclosure are all electrically connected,” and “the display module is electromagnetically shielded by the bezel and grounded through the hinge.” Nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reason as that regarding independent claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 44, and its dependent claims 32–35, are allowable over any combination of Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis.

Applicant believes the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Attorney for Applicant